

REMARKS

In the Office Communication, the Examiner asserts that the amendment filed on June 25, 2004, is not fully responsive because the reply does not comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because it does not include arguments pointing out specific distinctions
5 believed to render that the added claims 29-35 are patentable over the applied references. In particular, the Examiner asserts that it is confusing as to where the Simonson reference was used in the prior Office Action. In addition, the Examiner asserts that claims 29-35 were not present in the last amendment of record.

Regarding the Examiner's assertion that the reply does not include
10 arguments pointing out specific distinctions believed to render that the added claims 29-35 are patentable over the applied references, Applicant notes that "an argument pointing out specific distinctions" was presented in the amendment filed on June 25, 2004. In particular, Applicant asserted that Freeman, Bohannon, Allard, and Simonson, alone or in any combination, do not disclose or suggest receiving a request for said electronic
15 document, said request including a requested time-stamp and a *domain name*, wherein said *domain name is associated with a first domain for a first time period and a second domain for a second time period*; and *identifying one of said first domain or said second domain utilizing a time indicated by said time-stamp*. Applicant believes that this argument meets the requirements of 37 CFR 1.111(b).

20 Regarding the Examiner's assertion that it is confusing as to where the Simonson reference was used in the prior Office Action, Applicant acknowledges that claims 29-35 were added in the amendment filed on June 25, 2004, and that the cited reference was not used in the prior Office Action. Applicant was simply noting that, in addition to being patentable over the references cited in the Office Action, the new claims
25 are patentable over the Simonson reference, which was submitted in an IDS with the Office Action Response.

All of the pending claims, i.e., claims 1 through 35, are in condition for allowance and such favorable action is earnestly solicited.

If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further
30 suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

The Examiner's attention to this matter is appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kevin M. Mason". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Kevin" being more prominent than the last name "Mason".

Kevin M. Mason

Attorney for Applicants

Reg. No. 36,597

Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP

1300 Post Road, Suite 205

Fairfield, CT 06824

(203) 255-6560

Date: October 13, 2004

5

10